

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/849,927	HUDSON, JOHN E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sudhanshu C. Pathak	2634	

All Participants:

(1) Sudhanshu C. Pathak.

(2) Peter Shakula.

Status of Application: Advisory Action

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 October 2005

Time: 11 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Yes

Claims discussed:

Yes

Prior art documents discussed:

No


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

---The interview was initiated in regards to the arguments presented in the After Final Rejection, more specifically the applicant indicated the examiner has not responded to the Arguments presented in amendment on Feb. 18th, 2005 regarding the type of channel (dispersive & non-dispersive) as discussed in the Remarks, the examiner responded by stating that this was not claimed in the claims.

--- Further it was discussed that the non-dispersive interferences of the channel are being equalized in the invention. The examiner indicated that this was also not claimed and it is further recommended that the applicant show where this is in the specification.

--- Further it was discussed that the examiner did not provide any motivation to combine AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) with the DiToro (4,058,713) reference. The examiner provided (showed) the motivation to combine in the Final rejection, and further provided an explanation that both the AAPA and DiToro discuss a system implemented in a dispersive channel environment so it would be viable to combine.

--- Further it was indicated by the examiner if the discussed subject matter in the interview as disclosed above were claimed a new consideration (or search) would be required.